

University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

3-11-1996

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 11, 1996

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©1996 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 11, 1996" (1996). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 799.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/799

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

FACULTY SENATE

March 11, 1996

1503

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 26, 1996 Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No representatives of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Gable: The Chair distributed dates for Committee Reports.
3. Comments from Provost Marlin.
 - The Provost distributed and reviewed a "Legislative Update/Alert" report from Pat Geadelmann, Director of Governmental Relations.
 - The Board of Regents meets next week at Iowa State University, Ames. Items of interest to UNI include UNI's Report on Student Outcomes Assessment, Report on Centers and Institutes, and a discussion of a Request For Proposals (RFP) for a new telephone system at UNI.
 - Reminded Senators of the Faculty Meeting for April 15 to vote on the Quality in the Curriculum Report.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 589 Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council.
 The Graduate Council requested that the Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council be withdrawn and considered at a later date because the report contains inaccuracies. Haack/Van Wormer moved/seconded to docket because of special circumstances for April 8, 1996. De Nault/Haack moved/seconded to amend the motion by adding "If senators have received the complete report by April 3, 1996." Motion to amend carried.
 Main motion, as amended, "to docket because of special circumstances for April 8, 1996, if senators have received the complete report by April 3, 1996," carried. Docket 517.

NEW BUSINESS

Request from Joel Haack to amend the following motion passed by the University Senate on February 26, 1996: "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue. Exceptions for individual students should be considered using the standard Student Appeal form." (Calendar item 577, Docket Number 505.)
 Haack/De Nault moved/seconded to docket in regular order.
 Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion to substitute carried.
 The main motion, "to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order," carried. Docket 518.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 518 577 Request from Joel Haack to amend the following motion passed by the University Senate on February 26, 1996: "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue. Exceptions for individual students should be considered using the standard Student Appeal form." (Calendar item 577, Docket Number 505.)
 Haack/Amend moved/seconded to amend the previously passed motion to read "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration. Further, as part of its charge to departments for the next curricular cycle, the Curriculum Committee shall instruct departments to examine the prerequisites for courses to ensure that the prerequisites listed in the catalog are enforceable."
 Haack/Amend moved/seconded to strike the last sentence of the amendment. Motion to amend the motion on the floor carried.
 The main motion to amend the previously passed motion to read "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue

- that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration" carried.
- 512 584 Proposal from Ed Amend to Establish an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Community College Articulation.
Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to Establish an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Community College Articulation. Motion carried.
- 513 585 Proposal by Joel Haack to change the High School Course Requirements in Mathematics for Admission to the University of Northern Iowa effective Fall 1998.
Haack/Gilpin moved/seconded to change the current high school mathematics entrance requirement from "3 years, including one year of algebra and sequential courses of increasing difficulty" to "3 years, including the equivalent of two years of algebra and one year of geometry. The change to become effective Fall 1998."
De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to extend the time for adjournment until discussion of Docket Item 513 had concluded. Motion carried.
Main motion to change current high school mathematics entrance requirements carried.

CALL TO ORDER

The faculty senate was called to order by Chair Gable at 3:32 PM in the Board Room, Gilchrist Hall

Present: Mahmood Yousefi, Randall Krieg, Dean Primrose, Sherry Gable, Carol Cooper, Merrie Schroeder, Ed Amend, Scott Cawelti, Martha Reineke, Jerome Soneson, Ken De Nault, Paul Shand, Joel Haack, Andrew Gilpin, Katherine Van Wormer, Barbara Weeg, Sue Grosboll, Phil Patton (late), Barbara Lounsberry (ex-officio) and Forest Conklin, Parliamentarian (non voting).

Alternates: Eric Henderson for Surendar Yadava.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Provost Marlin indicated that the actual amount of the Iowa House's budget recommendation was \$6,200,000 below the Governor's recommendation. The minutes of the February 26, 1996 Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No representatives of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Gable.
The Chair distributed the following dates for Committee Reports:

<u>Standing Committees of the Senate</u>	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Report Date</u>
Admission and Retention	Clayton	April
Bachelor of Liberal Studies	Cox	April 22
Committees	Duncan	April
Curricula	Bubser	April 8
Educational Policies Committee	Campbell	April 8
General Education	Berg	April 22
Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council	Whitsett	April 22
Military Science Liaison and Advisory Committee	Nelson	April 8 or 22
Student Academic Appeals Board	Bubser	April 22
Tenure and Promotion Committee	Yoder	April
 <u>Ad Hoc Committees</u>	 <u>Chair</u>	 <u>Report Date</u>
Catalogue	Patton/Brown	April
Committee Study	Cooper	April

Faculty Productivity	De Nault	April 22
Other Committees	Chair	Report Date
Calendar	Patton	April
Center of the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning	Sell	April
Graduate Council	Crew	April 8

3. Comments from Provost Marlin.

- The Provost distributed and reviewed a "Legislative Update/Alert" report from Pat Geadelmann, Director of Governmental Relations. (A copy of the complete "Legislative Update/Alert" document can be obtained from the Office of Governmental Relations or the Secretary to the Senate.)
 - A. The good news is that the House approved a bill that included \$6.5 million for the School of Music Classroom Building/Performing Arts Center, the same amount recommended by the Governor.
 - B. The bad news is that though the House bill contains a \$587,688 increase in UNI's General Operating Budget, this is \$389,600 less than what the Governor recommended. The Bill deducts \$100,000 from the base budget of UNI's Institute for Decision Making, with an expectation that the amount will be made up by charging fees to the communities it serves. However, rural Iowa communities do not have the funds for this. There is a reduction in the Library inflation amount, elimination of the State Subsidy for Access Plus (support for interlibrary loan to other public libraries), and zeroes out the Board of Regent's Office Budget. This cost will need to come from the Universities.
 - C. The Provost reiterated Director Geadelmann's call for the UNI community to contact legislators.
- The Board of Regents meets next week at Iowa State University, Ames. Items of interest to UNI include UNI's Report on Student Outcomes Assessment, Report on Centers and Institutes, and a discussion of a Request For Proposals (RFP) for a new telephone system at UNI.
- Reminded Senators of the Faculty Meeting for April 15 to vote on the Quality in the Curriculum Report.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

589 Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council.

Chair Gable announced that the Graduate Council has requested that the Report of the University Committee on Curricula and the Graduate Council be withdrawn and considered at a later date because the report contains inaccuracies.

Haack/Van Wormer moved/seconded to docket because of special circumstances for April 8, 1996.

Cooper stated that the report she received was missing a minor in Leisure Services. Gable responded that her understanding was that the undergraduate portion of the report was complete. The errors were with the graduate portion of the report. Cawelti was hesitant to approve the motion without assurances that senators would receive the corrected report in advance of the April 8 meeting. Haack stated that he anticipates the changes will not be substantial. Cooper noted that financial impact statements for new programs were not present. She felt that these should be part of the package. Gable concurred.

De Nault/Haack moved/seconded to amend the motion by adding "If senators have received the complete report by April 3, 1996." De Nault expressed an aversion to having to react to material that is distributed the day of a meeting. He felt that senators should have adequate time to examine the package. Motion to amend carried.

Main motion, as amended, "to docket because of special circumstances for April 8, 1996, if senators have received the complete report by April 3, 1996," carried. Docket 517.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Request from Joel Haack to amend the following motion passed by the University Senate on February 26, 1996:

"The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue. Exceptions for individual students should be considered using the standard Student Appeal form." (Calendar item 577, Docket Number 505.)

The amended motion would read: "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration. Further, as part of its charge to departments for the next curricular cycle, the Curriculum Committee shall instruct departments to examine the prerequisites for courses to ensure that the prerequisites listed in the catalog are enforceable."

Haack/De Nault moved/seconded to docket in regular order.

Amend stated that because it is from a previous meeting and discussion is fresh in our minds, we should discuss it today.

Amend/Cawelti moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order.

Soneson wondered if we should discuss this because Registrar Patton was not present. Doug Koschmeder, Associate Registrar, stated that he was present to represent the Registrar's Office.

Motion to substitute carried.

The main motion, "to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order," carried. Docket 518.

2. The Chair called for a vote for two representatives to the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee. The list of nominees received by the Chair were distributed. By written ballot, Forrest Conklin and Dean Primrose were selected by the Senate to be representatives on the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee.
3. De Nault stated that he had received several inquiries about a comment in the Minutes of February 12, 1996, where it was stated that the Registrar's Office had given athletes priority registration after the Senate had voted to withhold this privilege until after the Educational Policies Commission had examined the entire issue of priority registration. Koschmeder stated that athletes had been given priority registration privileges for Spring 1996 but that this privilege would end beginning with Summer 1996.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 518 577 Request from Joel Haack to amend the following motion passed by the University Senate on February 26, 1996:

"The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue. Exceptions for individual students should be considered using the standard Student Appeal form." (Calendar item 577, Docket Number 505.)

Haack/Amend moved/seconded to amend the previously passed motion to read "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration. Further, as part of its charge to departments for the next curricular cycle, the Curriculum Committee shall instruct departments to examine the prerequisites for courses to ensure that the prerequisites listed in the catalog are enforceable."

Haack spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that there are prerequisites in the catalogue that cannot be enforced. For example, in mathematics a grade of C- is required in Calculus I to enroll in Calculus II. Because students are registering now for next fall, grades for Calculus I would not be known. The Registrar could determine which students did have the prerequisites after grades were turned in. There are other requirements that are difficult to enforce. Haack did not want money transferred to the Registrar's Office to enable enforcement of prerequisites. He would prefer to see a balance between enforcement and economics. He further felt that Departments should go back and look at prerequisites that were only advisory. In summary, he did not want to ask the Registrar to do things that could not be done.

Gabel asked, as a point of information, if certain prerequisites are not going to be enforced, how would this be communicated to the faculty. Who will be responsible for enforcing prerequisites. Haack felt that some prerequisites were designed to be only advisory. Cooper responded that faculty can enforce prerequisites the first day of class.

De Nault asked Koschmeder to enumerate those prerequisites that cannot be enforced.

Koschmeder replied that the present system has problems with minimum grade in course A needed to enroll in course B, pre- or co-requisites, and course A or equivalent where an equivalent course is not defined.

Primrose questioned the "or equivalent" problem. He felt this problem will increase as we become more of a three-year rather than a four year institution. Koschmeder stated that the system can handle transfer students where the courses they have taken can be entered into the system as equivalent UNI courses. He did not feel that this was going to be a problem. The problem comes when the prerequisite is an "equivalent" course. This especially becomes a problem with high school transcripts.

Gilpin stated that there were two issues. The first was ambiguous criteria where one could not expect the Registrar to enforce prerequisites when information is missing. A second issue was whether how we record records mechanically (or electronically) should dictate policy about the curriculum. Gilpin felt strongly that faculty should be making decisions about what kinds of sequencing and other decision about the curricula.

Gable asked what resources would be needed to handle the problems.

Koschmeder replied that few institutions they asked do prerequisite checking. However, Penn State does check. Koschmeder felt that they were catching 99% of the prerequisites.

Haack stated that until computerized registration, the Registrar did not check prerequisites.

Reineke questioned the clause in the motion that states "that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration." This would make impossible "equivalent" language even if pedagogy made the equivalence important.

Gable asked for a definition of "enforceable."

Haack replied that the motion stated "enforceable at the time of registration."

Amend felt that the Senate was trying to legislate something that is difficult to work out. Amend endorsed the amendment to the motion and then argued to defeat the main motion.

Cawelti asked if it was the faculty's responsibility to check on prerequisites. He wondered whose responsibility it is to check prerequisites.

Amend replied that if a student wants to risk a course without the prerequisites, he does not discourage them the first week of class. If the schedule states a certain prerequisite for his course, he will ask if they have had these courses but if students feel they can do the course work, he does not enforce the prerequisites. For example, consider the terrible 100g "junior standing" prerequisite. We have some very bright freshmen and sophomores that take these courses and at the same time some not so bright "g" students. He felt that it is the individual instructor who has responsibility for monitoring the preparation or imposing a gate for a course if a gate is absolutely needed.

Soneson stated that there is the problem of students who sign up for a course that should not be signing up of a course. These students fill the course so that qualified students who should and could enroll may miss the opportunity. He would like to see this caught.

De Nault reviewed the history of the motion. The petitioners were asked by their department heads to fill out a questionnaire from the Registrar asking which prerequisites (if any) were to be enforced for each course they taught. The petitioners questioned the time it took to complete the form as the information about prerequisites was already in the catalogue. The petitioners were also concerned about the integrity of the curriculum because they felt prerequisites were part of the curriculum. Allowing individual faculty (or department heads) to selectively enforce prerequisites would create chaos in General Education courses, such as Capstone. Subsequent communications between the Registrar and Dean Somervill indicates that the Registrar has changed prerequisites without these changes going through the established curricular process. The petitioners believe that prerequisites are part of the curriculum and any changes must be made by the faculty through the appropriate curriculum process.

De Nault went on to state that there were courses where prerequisites needed to be enforced. He related the necessity of such enforcement for geologic field trips where the number of spaces is limited and it is essential to budgeting to fill each spot. Students have enrolled in these courses who have not meet the prerequisites.

Amend asked how the Registrar was supposed to enforce this.

De Nault replied that the course requires "approval of instructor." He stated that inquires to the Registrar about this had gone unanswered. De Nault further reiterated his position that the faculty make up the requirements and that the Registrar's job is to enforce them. Obviously, we can not expect the Registrar to enforce the impossible. On the other hand, a blanket statement letting the Registrar choose what to enforce is not correct. He felt that if there was a problem in enforcement of a prerequisite, it was the responsibility of the Registrar to come to the faculty with the enforcement problem. The Registrar's Office has not come forth with an enumeration of difficulties.

Cawelti asked whether De Nault was arguing for or against the motion. De Nault replied that he was arguing against the motion to amend the motion previously passed by the faculty. He felt that it should be the Registrar's responsibility to come to the faculty with an articulation of any problems. The proposed amendment makes it the faculty's responsibility.

Koschmeder stated that enforcement of the Sphere I and Sphere II prerequisites for Capstone was especially difficult for transfer students.

Lounsberry pointed out the problem of students who took a Sphere II course but who did not earn a passing grade.

Reineke asked about instructors signatures. Koschmeder replied that signatures can be entered electronically or in written form. However, the Registrar's Office does not know all the faculty's signatures.

Reineke stated that there needs to be a mutual responsibility. Departments need to be looking at their courses to determine which prerequisites are enforceable. In addition, Departments need to be looking to the Registrar to find out which of their prerequisites are not enforceable.

Haack stated that Sphere I and Sphere II prerequisites for Capstone cannot be enforced.

Haack/Amend moved/seconded to strike the last sentence of the amendment. Motion to amend the motion on the floor carried.

De Nault argued to defeat the amendment to the previous motion. He related how the Registrar's enforcement of prerequisites had changed since the Registrar's Office meet with his department last Fall. He felt that the Registrar should bring to the Senate specific prerequisites that cannot be enforced. He was uneasy with simply allowing the Registrar to define what could and could not be enforced electronically.

Amend replied that the electronic system has enabled more enforcement of prerequisites than heretofore. He felt that the Registrar's Office was improving management of curriculum.

De Nault asked Koschmeder whether the Registrar's Office would go back and reinstate prerequisites that were changed by departments without going through the curricular process. Koschmeder did not answer the question.

Lounsberry felt that faculty want some assurance that when the Registrar's Office identifies prerequisites that cannot be checked that departments would be informed. Koschmeder agreed to this.

Gable asked if the Registrar's Office would do this on a semester by semester basis. Koschmeder replied that they would.

Soneson questioned the value of passing the amendment. Would this give us assurance?

Haack stated that the amendment would make sure that the Registrar would enforce all prerequisites that it can enforce.

After discussion of parliamentary procedure, Secretary De Nault stated that the previously passed motion, if amended, would read, "The University Senate requests that the Registrar enforce prerequisites and other course restrictions that are in the University Catalogue that can be enforced electronically at the time of student registration."

Motion to amend the previously passed motion carried.

- 512 584 Proposal from Ed Amend to Establish an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Community College Articulation.

Amend/Yousefi moved/seconded to Establish an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Community College Articulation.

Amend argued that articulation information is mostly anecdotal. He would like a more systematic

gathering of information.

Cooper asked if the proposed committee would look at only Iowa Community Colleges. Amend replied that was the intent.

Cawelti wondered if the Community Colleges were going to take kindly to us reviewing their credentials. He wondered whether we have the authority to go in and get this information.

Amend replied that with this information we would be better informed. The information could be gathered in a delicate diplomatic fashion.

Gable stated that we probably could not request the information directly but that the information may be available in community college catalogues.

Reineke stated that this study would be in the interest of the community colleges. The anecdotal evidence is damaging to their reputation. This information would either silence critics or confirm their fears. If the anecdotes are backed up by facts, she did not know why any community college would not want to hear this information. She felt that the rumor mill was doing more damage to them now.

Patton stated that data relative to student achievement is available. He had severe reservations about evaluating community college faculty. He would prefer that we look at ourselves and see how we look.

Amend replied that he had received an e-mail message from a student's parent indicating that her son has received instruction from four adjunct instructors.

Cooper stated that academic credentials are public record. There should not be any difficulty in obtaining these.

Primrose asked what was to be done if community colleges do not meet our criteria.

Amend stated that we should then look at articulate agreements. Faculty at community colleges are colleagues. In some cases they are teaching under difficult circumstances. He thought that the more we are informed, the more support we can give them. We could request them to have higher standards and upgrade their credentials. At present, we are delegating our entire General Education program to these institutions. We need to know what is being fed into this.

Reineke related that last spring at the interviews with Presidential candidates a common theme was the articulation agreements. Many faculty have strong feelings about these and these feelings are based upon anecdotal information. There are our first-semester graduate students teaching at Hawkeye Community College and while they are welcome here as graduate students, faculty question how they can be teaching out there. It is time to get a factual information base. We represent the faculty. If the data supports faculty concerns, then it is our job to decide what to do with that information. If the data does not support the anecdotes, it is our obligation to inform the faculty of this.

De Nault stated that we should not lose sight that the goal is to know how well students are prepared. The Registrar has indicated that there is data available on this issue. However, he did support the establishment of the proposed committee because we would be better informed about the background and preparation of transfer students.

De Nault asked Registrar Patton whether articulation agreements are between UNI and community colleges or between the Board of Regents and community colleges.

Patton replied that there are both. There are Regent's agreements, such as the acceptance of the AA Degree, and UNI agreements, like program agreements.

Patton felt that it would be helpful if we could have faculty exchanges between UNI and community colleges. One of the main orders of business of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations, an articulation committee, this year is to reinstitute visits among the community colleges and the regents' institutions. He favored these exchanges as a means to exchange expectations.

Yousefi stated that we are not interested in the quality of the faculty but the quality of the students they produce. Therefore, we need to get hold of syllabi and talk about the content of the courses they teach. These are the items of importance.

Schroeder asked if the Chairs of the Senates at the three institutions have discussed this matter. Gable replied that they had not. Schroeder wondered whether UNI was picking up most of the community college students or whether it was evenly distributed.

Reineke produced a study published in the Des Moines Register that indicated that Iowa State enrolled 750 community college transfers, UNI 650, and the University of Iowa 550.

Primrose recalled a conversation with former President Curris where the President was adamant that if faculty knew that a particular course given at a particular school was not up to quality standards, he would back the faculty to the hilt to go to that school and tell them that they needed to correct this course. Yousefi stated that President Curris is no longer here. Primrose reiterated that we should look at courses rather than agreements.

Patton stated that course descriptions are reviewed by Iowa State and the University of Iowa. Students are not being prepared just for UNI. Primrose responded that he was concerned about individual students coming from a particular course that were not prepared.

Reineke stated that she was concerned about the credentials of faculty at community colleges. She noted that in Missouri and Kansas you must have a masters degree to teach at a community college. Iowa does not have this requirement. She did not understand why we would not want the highest requirements. She hoped that the Regents would begin a dialogue with the community colleges that might help improve the community colleges.

Cawelti called for the question.

Motion to Establish an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Community College Articulation carried.

The Chair asked Senators to forward to her nominations for the Committee.

- 513 585 Proposal by Joel Haack to change the High School Course Requirements in Mathematics for Admission to the University of Northern Iowa effective Fall 1998.

Haack/Gilpin moved/seconded to change the current high school mathematics entrance requirement from "3 years, including one year of algebra and sequential courses of increasing difficulty" to "3 years, including the equivalent of two years of algebra and one year of geometry. The change to become effective Fall 1998."

Van Wormer stated that she did not like the rigidity of the proposed change. She felt that there was too much of a math requirement already. She would prefer that high school students have more exposure to English and the Great Books. She did not see the need for Algebra II.

Reineke asked what the phrase "sequential courses of increasing difficulty" meant in practice.

Haack stated that the interpretation of this phrase is not clear. On talking with David Duncan (former

Head of the Department of Mathematics), Haack found out that the phrase had been interpreted to mean one year of algebra (at any time in the sequence) and other courses. In fact, the third course may not have even been a mathematics course. The interpretation has been very broad. At institutions of higher learning that he is familiar with, three years of high school mathematics means two years of algebra followed by one year of geometry.

De Nault argued that a college graduate should be capable of using algebra. He complained that many students in the sciences did not understand basic trigonometry. Some of these students have had physics and still did not know what sine, cosine, or tangent are. He wondered if students would have some exposure to trigonometry if they had two years of high school algebra.

Cooper expressed similar concern about trigonometry. She also asked where trigonometry would fit into the proposal.

Haack stated that the serious study of trigonometry is not included but that students may be exposed to a first look at trigonometry in either a geometry or an algebra course. There is a movement in many high schools toward a core curriculum that does not provide such a rigid, in depth algebra I, II, and geometry. That is one reason why the phrase "or equivalent" is included in the proposal. He stated that "Tech-Prep Math" that is offered in some high schools is equivalent to Algebra I.

Reineke asked what the mathematics entrance requirements were at Iowa and Iowa State. Haack replied that at Iowa and Iowa State the requirement is two years of Algebra and one year of Geometry for Liberal Arts majors. Iowa State requires four years of mathematics for engineering majors.

Reineke spoke in favor of the motion. She pointed out that every major national study in the last decade has indicated that a weakness in the employability and preparation for employment of our students is the lack of math preparation. We need to do everything possible to encourage a level of mathematical rigor that will enhance the worth of our degrees. Putting this at the front end by use of entrance requirements will enhance students' opportunities at UNI. We should either meet the standards of the other schools or exceed them. We should not be behind them.

Primrose questioned why this requirement should apply to all students. He would prefer that high school students have more time to explore the arts and other areas. He did not want the high school curriculum to be so narrowly focused. He wondered how we would handle schools that simply repackaged mathematics courses to sound like they are Algebra II. Another area of concern is the articulation agreements. He wondered how this proposal would guarantee that students entering from community colleges would be better prepared. He was concerned that we are legislating curriculum to high schools and not allowing them to provide the breadth of education that he would like them to provide. He was not sure that the proposal would make for better math students. If the mathematics department wants this preparation, they should have it as a prerequisite for admission to the math program.

Soneson spoke in favor of the proposal. He did not think that the proposal for two years of algebra and one year of geometry is only for math students. He is convinced that math helps students think precisely. He gets students who cannot think with precision. Math encourages students to be careful and to pay attention to detail.

Patton did not want to speak against the motion but was concerned about students who wanted admission but who had not completed the requirements.

Haack stated that if we were in the vanguard of proposing these requirements, there could be concern. However, high schools are already offering these courses. They do not need to add anything to their curriculum. The proposal will not require high schools to hire more math teachers. The courses and teachers are already in place.

Chair Gable pointed out that it was 5:00 PM and time for adjournment, unless there was a motion to extend the time of the meeting.

De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to extend the time for adjournment until discussion of Docket Item 513 had concluded. Motion carried.

Yousefi noted that though we now require algebra, the overwhelming majority of students in his Economics I and II classes do not understand rudimentary algebra problems. He does not know the reason, whether inadequate high school preparation or the quality of their preparation, but he has had this problem for over 20 years.

Henderson spoke against the motion because of his experience with secondary schools in Cedar Falls where math courses are offered at a later time than in other school systems. His daughter currently is facing a problem trying to get into math courses. As she moves along in her studies, there are barriers to her math preparation. He felt that students would be better off learning their math at UNI rather than in the high schools.

Haack disagreed because a one semester algebra course at UNI cannot adequately prepare students.

Gilpin expressed amazement that we did not already have this entrance requirement. It was inconceivable that a good college preparation program does not include two years of algebra and a year of geometry. He would like to see us also require trigonometry.

Primrose stated that mathematics was not the only course that helps students organize. He was disappointed that we looked upon mathematics to do this. He thought there were a lot of other courses that did this. These courses develop thinking skills. He thought this can be accomplished in a writing course. If better thinking was what was needed, why not just require 15 more hours of critical thinking. This would be a lot more useful to the general population. He also felt that entering students should have keyboarding skills so that they can write adequately. He was concerned about the proposal. This has become a regents' requirement. He was concerned that just because students have had the courses does not ensure that students have the expected skills. He argued for an entrance examination.

Henderson agreed.

Yousefi did not know what was the optimum solution. However, an overwhelming number of students in this country are weak in math. He did not know what to do about it but he thought that the fact that students come to his classes without adequate preparation in algebra and geometry is a reflection of the problem.

Reineke stated that one thing that does work is for us to set the standards. If there are enough complaints to high schools, the historic response has been for the high schools to respond by upping their standards. Nothing will happen if we wait for High Schools to raise their standards. We need to show leadership.

Schroeder stated that seasoned educators, such as ourselves, through the mathematical reform movement that what is happening in the Algebra I and II is different from when we took these courses. There is more emphasis on critical thinking and computer skills. She thinks it will be an unfortunate situation if our students are not as competitive in general education.

The motion to change the current high school mathematics entrance requirement from "3 years, including one year of algebra and sequential courses of increasing difficulty" to "3 years, including the equivalent of two years of algebra and one year of geometry. The change to become effective Fall 1998," carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gable declared the meeting adjourned at 5:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kenneth J. De Nault".

Kenneth J. De Nault, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

Approved March 25, 1996